

REMARKS

In the Office Action of June 15, 2005, claims 1-17 were allowed. Claims 18 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by Yechuri, U.S. Patent No. 6,560,567. Claim 20 was indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

The rejection of claims 18 and 19 as anticipated by Yechuri is respectfully traversed. As the Examiner notes, circuits 1202 and 1204 are used to model a device under test (DUT). However, two devices are being modeled. The first circuit 1202 is used to model DUT A whose capacitance is C_A and second circuit 1204 is used to model modified DUT B whose capacitance is C_B . See Col. 11, lines 8-11. DUT A has width and length, W_A and L_A . See, Col. 11, line 12 and Equation 18 of Yechuri. Similarly, DUT B has width and length, W_B and L_B . See, Col. 11, lines 12 and 13 and Equation 19.

Frequency measurement sweeps of the two circuits are then made as in step 912 of Fig. 9. See, Col. 10, lines 31 and 32 and Col. 11, lines 19 and 20. Models are then fit to the data at steps 914 and 916, the models are compared at step 918 and differences between the models are associated at step 920 with differences between the selected DUT A and the modified DUT B. As a result, it is asserted at Col. 11, lines 37-39 that device impedance can be determined as a function of device dimension(s).

Whatever may be the merits of the Yechuri measurement system, it does not anticipate the test structure claimed by applicants. Specifically, Yechuri does not describe an LC oscillator circuit having an oscillation frequency related to a parasitic inductance associated with a subcircuit in an integrated circuit. Circuits 1202 and 1204 are filter circuits and the differences in the performance of these circuits is compared with the differences in the performance of

models of these circuits. Nor is there any indication in Yechuri that the test structure is located adjacent the integrated circuit in which the parasitic inductance is located.

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claim 18 is patentable over Yechuri. Dependent claim 19 is believed patentable for the same reason claim 18 is patentable.

Dependent claim 20 has already been indicated to be patentable.


Newly added independent claim 21 is believed patentable for the same reason claims 18 and 19 are patentable. Newly added dependent claim 22 is believed patentable for the same reason claim 20 is patentable.

Aside from the fee for an extension of time and the additional claims, no additional fee is believed to be due for filing this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge such fee to Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP Deposit Account No. 50-0310.

If the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite prosecution of this application, he is invited to call applicant's attorney at the number given below.

Date: December 15, 2005

Respectfully submitted,


Francis E. Morris 24,615
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP (Reg. No.)
101 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10178
(212) 309-6632